

WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)
(Partial translation)

Date of mailing: 11. 05. 2004 (day/month/year)
International application No.: PCT/JP03/08595
International filing date: 07. 07. 2003
Priority Date: 03. 09. 2002
Applicant: TOYOTA JIDOSHA KABUSHIKI KAISHA

This is the second written opinion
established by International Preliminary Examination Authority.

Box No. I

1. This opinion has been established on the basis of,
- ☒ the description page No.1, 3-22 as submitted at the time of filing.
 - ☒ the description page No.1, 3-22 as submitted
with the letter dated 08. 03. 2004.
 - ☒ Claims 4-9 as submitted at the time of filing.
 - ☒ Claims 1-3 as submitted with the letter dated 08. 03. 2004.
 - ☒ the drawings as submitted by the applicant.

Box No. V

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims 1-9
	No:
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims 1-9
	No:
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims 1-9
	No:

2. Citations and explanations

Document 1: JP10-246132 [0033] - [0039]
Document 2: JP2000-274270 [0039] - [0041]
Document 3: JP02-027124 all
Document 4: EP 349993 all
Document 5: JP2002-030952 all
Document 6: JP2001-065382 all
Document 7: JP2001-171378 all

Claims 1-9

Both D1 and D2 disclose a technique of controlling a skid by lowering degree of composite torque, which is obtained by engine torque and motor torque, when a skid is occurring in a hybrid vehicle. D1 further disclose a technique of lowering the degree of the composite torque, by lowering only the motor torque degree while keeping the engine torque degree. D3 and D4 disclose a skid control technique of restoring engine torque level gradually after convergence of a skid. D5, D6 and D7 disclose a hybrid vehicle in which a skid is controlled by distribution of torque output to front and rear wheels, when a skid is occurring.

However, any of D1 through D7 does not describe or suggest relation between a power restriction rate and a torque restriction rate. Thus, features of the claims 1-9 are not obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Box No.VIII

Comments regarding adequate support

In the present application, claim 1 describes "limits the power demand ... with a power restriction rate that is regulated to have a specified relation to a torque restriction rate", while claim 2 describes "limits the power demand ... with a fixed setting of the power restriction rate". The description Claim 2 lacks of consistency with the description of claim 1.